

### REMARKS

The original Office Action (Paper Number #7 as well) dated February 26, 2004 was erroneously delivered to the previous correspondence address. The previous correspondence address was properly changed by the Request for Withdrawal as Attorney filed on November 17, 2003, which was granted by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. After phone calls with Examiner Dinh on March 17, 2004 and March 19, 2004, the Office Action (Paper Number #7) was resent on March 31, 2004. The period for reply for the Office Action was reset based on the mailing data of March 31, 2004. This response is to the Office Action (Paper Number #7) dated March 31, 2004.

Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1-21 are rejected. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the remarks set forth below.

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,065,002 to Knotts et. al. (hereinafter "Knotts") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,566,330 to Sheffield et. al. (hereinafter "Sheffield"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 1 recites a design tool subsystem that creates a set of specifications in response to user input, the set of specifications defining a template for user-desired processing services to be performed; wherein the specifications identify processing properties for said processing services to define the execution of a batch application.

The Office Action recites col. 5, lines 53-64 in Knotts to teach the limitation of "the specifications identify processing properties for said processing services" as recited

in claim 1 of the present application. Knotts teaches a user interface to a relational database to provide simplified data access for users. The cited portion of col. 5, lines 53-64 in Knotts teaches a template that includes attributes of data to be selected by the user. However, these attributes of data are not processing properties for processing services because the attributes do not define how processing is performed. Thus, Applicants fail to see how the templates in Knotts identify processing properties for the processing services to define the execution of a batch application as recited in claim 1 of the present application. Some examples of processing properties for the processing services to define the execution of a batch application are execution time parameters and the number of database records that is desired to be processed, which are disclosed in paragraph 78 and 79 on pages 10 and 11 of the present application. Therefore, absent any teaching of processing properties, Knotts does not teach or suggest this claim limitation of claim 1.

The Office Action states that “Knotts is silent on the design tool subsystem to create the template.” The Office Action then states, “Sheffield teaches a design tool subsystem (GUI) for creating reusable and modifiable database interface object (i.e. template).” Sheffield teaches a “data window painter” that defines a program object called a DataWindow. The DataWindow is an interactive application in which the user may edit data as depicted in FIG. 9 in Sheffield. Thus, in Sheffield, the “data window painter” defines an interactive application. By contrast, claim 1 of the present application recites a design tool subsystem that creates specifications that identifies processing properties for processing services to define the execution of a batch application. Applicants fail to see any teaching of batch applications that are defined through a design

tool subsystem in Sheffield. Therefore, absent any teaching of batch processing, Sheffield does not teach or suggest this claim limitation of claim 1.

The Office Action recites that Sheffield would have been combined with Knotts because "it would have enable[d] a user to create the template without extensive knowledge of database operation nor code database operations in a programming language." However, one skilled in the art would not have combined Sheffield with Knotts because the data window painter of Sheffield is used to define interactive applications such as windows. There is no teaching or suggestion of using the data window painter of Sheffield to define templates of attributes of data as taught in Knotts. Thus, claim 1 is allowable for the above stated reasons.

Claims 2 and 3 are dependent on claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Additionally, in col. 2, lines 8-13 of Sheffield, the suggestion that the end user and the applications programmer could be the same person fails to suggest implementing the processing subsystem using the first computer or a second computer as recited respectively in claims 2 and 3. For example, the identity of the end user and the application programmer does not necessarily suggest how a processing subsystem is implemented.

Claim 4 is dependent on claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 5 is dependent on claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 6 and 9 are dependent either directly or indirectly on claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Additionally, in FIG. 1 of Knotts, input

22 and output 36 and 38, and col. 6, lines 42-52 of Knotts do not teach or suggest an input/output middleware subsystem as in claims 6 and 9. Instead, the devices such as input device 22, display 36, and printer 38 are taught in Knotts without specifically mentioning input/output middleware.

Claims 7-8 are dependent on claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Additionally, the Office Action recites that “Knotts does not specifically disclose the processing subsystem being implemented on a second computer.” Subsequently, Applicants fail to see how Knotts could teach or suggest sending completion data and error data between the first computer and the second computer as recited in claims 7 and 8, respectively.

Claims 10-15, 16-18, and 19-21 are rejected under similar rationales as for claims 1-9 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1-9.

### CONCLUSION

Therefore, in view of the above remarks this application is in condition for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to allow this application. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative regarding any issues that the Examiner feels are still outstanding.

Respectfully submitted,

Shisler et al.

Date: 6/29/04

By: Eugene Kim

Eugene G. Kim  
Reg No. 46,267  
Carr & Ferrell *LLP*  
2200 Geng Road  
Palo Alto, California 94303  
Phone: (650) 812-3400  
Fax: (650) 812-3444